

July 18, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8893

persons "having a major agricultural interest."

"The fact is," he said, "they're not what they say they are. Anybody—whenever he is and wherever he lives—can join the Farm Bureau by buying their insurance. The Farm Bureau has repeatedly refused to publicize a breakdown of its membership. The reason is obvious. By deliberately misrepresenting itself to the Government, I believe they have forfeited their tax-exempt status. Furthermore, the Farm Bureau is engaged in money-making business activities which they have no right to engage in as a tax-exempt organization."

Mr. Resnick said, "the operation of this complex financial empire, much of which is tax-exempt, and therefore paid for by the American people, must be investigated by the Internal Revenue Service. I have asked for the answers to 18 specific questions. For example, can a tax-exempt organization legally own or operate corporations whose funds contribute to political and lobbying activities? Is a tax-exempt organization permitted to operate a commercial organization in competition with tax-paying private companies? Can the Farm Bureau be legitimately considered an agricultural organization, since a substantial part—probably a major portion—of its membership does not consist of farmers or persons having any agricultural interests?"

JULY 14, 1967.

Congressman Joseph Y. Resnick today predicted that the American Farm Bureau Federation will try to block publication of the hearings of the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Rural Development, of which Mr. Resnick is Chairman.

The New York Democrat said that he based his prediction on a letter from American Farm Bureau Secretary-Treasurer Roger Fleming, a copy of which was sent to every member of the House Agriculture Committee. Resnick charges this letter is "a blueprint for Agriculture Committee action to silence me and prevent further revelations about the Farm Bureau."

Congressman Resnick said, "The letter says 'It has been suggested that the hearings be terminated forthwith and the report of the Subcommittee's hearings not be published.' What it fails to mention is that it is the Farm Bureau that is doing the suggesting since this idea never existed until it came up in their letter."

"As a member of the Committee who received a copy of this letter, I was offended to find myself being told by this powerful lobby how to think and how to act," Resnick continued. "Now that the first aim of the Farm Bureau, the Committee Resolution against me, has been achieved, they will now concentrate on their next goal of squelching the Committee Report."

"This, of course, would serve the broader interests of the arch-conservative Farm Bureau, since the Committee hearings which went on for five weeks, were devoted to a study of living conditions in Rural America. The Farm Bureau has consistently opposed all progressive legislation in this field and, according to its own statement to the Subcommittee, violently opposes all federal legislation intended to alleviate poverty, promote better health, and improve education in our rural areas," he said.

This is the same letter in which Fleming called for the Agriculture Committee to adopt a resolution disassociating itself from charges made by Resnick during recent hearings of the Rural Development Subcommittee. Forty-eight hours after receiving the letter, the Committee, in a highly unusual action, voted in closed session to adopt such a resolution.

As evidence for his charges, Resnick cited the sequence of events and the "striking" similarity of language between the Farm Bu-

reau's letter and that of the Subcommittee's statement recommending adoption of the resolution.

He said that the letter, which was dated Friday, July 7th was received by all Committee members on Monday, July 10th. Resnick stated that the letter gave the Committee a choice, either to conduct a full committee investigation, or to disown the charges which he made.

"Since the committee members are mostly Farm Bureau members, they were not anxious to conduct any investigation, and so, following the Farm Bureau's script, they took the other option," he said.

The Subcommittee met 24 hours later and issued a statement recommending adoption of the resolution, "the wording of which closely resembles the wording in the letter," Resnick pointed out. The full Agriculture Committee met Tuesday and adopted the resolution.

The Farm Bureau's letter urges that the Committee "clear the record by adopting a resolution in which it *disassociates itself* from the attacks on Farm Bureau made by Subcommittee Chairman Resnick and by making known to the public at an early date its disposition of this matter."

The Subcommittee statement says, "We sincerely feel that the membership of the House as well as the general public should fully and clearly understand our position in *hereby disassociating ourselves*, as members of the Rural Development Subcommittee such unwarranted and irrelevant charges against the American Farm Bureau Federation."

Fleming's letter also charged that Mr. Resnick was carrying out a personal vendetta against the Farm Bureau.

"This was the first time that the concept of a personal attack was even mentioned," Resnick said, "and all of a sudden, there it is in the resolution. 'The committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives does in no manner endorse, condone, or support the *personal attack* launched by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Development upon the American Farm Bureau Federation.' How in the world can anyone consider an attack on a multi-billion dollar national corporation as personal? It's just a little ridiculous."

Since beginning his investigation of Farm Bureau financial activities on June 21st, Congressman Resnick has so far uncovered a network of 52 insurance companies, with interlocking directorates, whose total assets exceed \$1 billion and whose insurance-income exceeds \$10 billion.

This is in addition to a wide range of other business activities, many of which are tax exempt, including oil refineries, LP gas manufacturing companies, grain storage operations, fertilizer industries, shopping centers and other commercial activities.

A RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION PROVIDING A 4-YEAR TERM FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing a 4-year term for Members of the House.

Elections would be held in even-numbered years, with one-half of each State's delegation running for office in presidential election years, and the other half in so-called off years.

The amendment would also prohibit Members from seeking or accepting nomination to any other elective office while serving in this House.

The responsibilities which Members of this House are given to discharge continue to grow greater. As the years go by, the volume of legislation and the complexity of the problems faced by Members continue to increase.

More hours must be spent on the floor and in committee, and the 4- or 5-month session is a thing of the past. Being a Congressman is no longer a part-time job, and we can discern a similar trend in our State legislatures.

At the same time, the demands of seeking and retaining office, as distinct from legislative duties, are increasingly preempting the individual Member's time and energy.

Methods of campaigning become more sophisticated and more time consuming. Election pressures prompt constant commuting to the district during the entire session for speeches, appearances at functions of all kinds and perpetual fence mending.

It becomes all too clear that the demands of maintaining office within a 2-year cycle are disrupting our prime legislative function.

The practicalities of the present system demand that almost as soon as a Member is elected, he must start planning for his next campaign. Campaigning occupies many months of the second year of a 2-year term, and if a Member faces a primary contest in the spring, almost all of the second year is taken up with politicking.

The challenge to survival and the many diversions demanded by political activity become, for most of us, a cyclical repetition of enormous strain, which is seriously affecting the exercise of effective legislative action.

I do not for a moment mean to suggest that the duties in the district are not part and parcel of a Congressman's major functions. But I do stress the fact that the people we represent are short changed when the necessities of political survival hamper good government.

The entire Nation would benefit from a 4-year term. It would mean that a Congressman could get down to the business of government, without being forced to campaign for almost half of his term.

Another important aspect of the question is the fact that the costs of campaigning are reaching a point of absurdity, and most of us must make increasing outlays of cash to overcome frequent opposition.

Some time ago, U.S. News & World Report estimated that the average cost of an individual congressional campaign was \$75,000. I doubt if we can hope that cost will decrease in the future.

It is my feeling that many capable citizens are discouraged from entering political life because the financial demands are prohibitive.

The sad consequence of this is a perpetuation of a climate of political cynicism, and the discouragement of fresh new blood from seeking office.

I should also add that I have seen Member after Member leave the House

after a period of service because they could no longer take the pressures and expenses of campaigning every 2 years. We have lost some mighty fine Congressmen that way.

I have also concluded that the 2-year term is one of the elements which indirectly limit the ability of Representatives to fulfill a more decisive role in national affairs.

This has a bearing on the influence and power of the House itself as witness the fact that there have been complaints lately that the legislative branch has lost initiative to the executive. This evolution endangers the traditional balance of Federal power.

Such a trend is understandable, considering the global responsibilities which have devolved upon the United States in the past generation.

Nevertheless, I insist it is still true that Congress can wield powerful leverage if the administration lacks a manageable majority on Capitol Hill.

But, if we are to fulfill a meaningful function in the process of lawmaking, this House must have continuity. Leadership can never be intelligently exercised without it, and the possibility of change every 2 years surely limits continuity.

It is clear to me that if the House is to carry out a really constructive and lively role, we must lessen the burdens and uncertainties which a 2-year term makes inevitable.

Opponents of this amendment contend that a 2-year term must be maintained in order to keep Congress close to the people. I grant this is an important point. In fact, it is the one unquestioned benefit of the present 2-year cycle.

The amendment I propose would guarantee a congressional election every 2 years, so that we would not lose the off-year mandate. It is important to preserve a channel of expression of public opinion in off years, and we can do that by having half of each State's delegation elected in alternate biennial elections.

Thus, we can still give the people the opportunity to express approval or disapproval every 2 years, while establishing a 4-year tenure for Members of this House.

I am also convinced that the 4-year term would give the electorate a chance to maintain better perspective in making decisions at the polls. The congressman's record during a longer term would be easier to analyze and evaluate.

There would be far less chance of elections being decided on the basis of some temporary emotional flare-up over a momentary issue. Such flare-ups would be more likely to cool off in 4 years, leaving more room for reasonable, thoughtful judgments.

I certainly respect and honor the right of any individual to vote against me, but I would like to have his vote based on my record, not on an issue distorted by emotion.

Mr. Speaker, my experience convinces me that the voters' interests—hence, the national interest—are being compromised because Members of this House are increasingly overburdened with the tiring, time-consuming and expensive business of fighting for office every 2 years.

The problem will become more critical as our Nation's population increases, and our domestic and international problems become more complex. We can wait no longer to make this vital change.

File me
ISRAELI AMBASSADOR HARMAN CALLS FOR ARAB CHANGE OF POLICY TO INSURE PEACE IN NATIONAL PRESS CLUB ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to be an invited guest at the head table at the National Press Club luncheon to hear a very stimulating address by Ambassador Avraham Harman of Israel.

The Ambassador, in his prepared text, stated:

The road to peace in the Middle East is the same road as for peace in the world—it is the road of harmony in diversity—the search for common constructive interests.

Before a crowd of 300 members, National Press Club president, Mr. L. David LeRoy, Capitol Hill correspondent for the U.S. News & World Report, conducted a question and answer period which elicited newsworthy answers which revealed for the first time that the Government of Israel has already officially notified the Government of the United States that it will indemnify the United States for the losses sustained by the unfortunate attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty*; that on the day that the city of Jerusalem was unified, Prime Minister Eshkol had in his office a representative of every faith that has a holy place in Jerusalem. On that first day Prime Minister Eshkol informed these representatives that the Israel Government wanted each and every representative of the faiths to supervise their own holy place.

Under leave granted, I include the address of Ambassador Harman:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR AVRAHAM HARMAN OF ISRAEL, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 18, 1967

It is to the root causes of the situation in the Middle East that world statesmanship must address itself at the present time. The goal of peace and stability in the Middle East region cannot be attained by an artificial and unrealistic attempt to move backwards to belligerency. If the Middle East is to be insulated from the prospect of further danger to its own peoples and the world, it must move forward to a durable peace based on the mutual recognition by all the States in the area of their right to exist and the replacement of belligerence by genuine peaceful co-existence.

The root causes to which the world must address itself are:

- (1) The refusal by the Arab States to acknowledge the existence of Israel, except for the purpose of seeking to eliminate it.
- (2) The refusal, therefore, by the Arab States to move the armistice system forward to peace as the Armistice Agreements specifically provided.
- (3) The assertion by the Arab States of the rights of belligerence contrary to the Armistice Agreements, the resolutions of the Security Council and the Charter of the United Nations.

This assertion of belligerence results in the warlike acts: the blockade of the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran to Israel

shipping. Similarly it led to a diplomatic and economic offensive against Israel.

(4) In pursuance of the doctrine of belligerence the Arab States, particularly since 1955, embarked on an arms race at the expense of the economic welfare of their people.

(5) Since 1964 the real discussion in the Arab world was between the doctrine of a continuous day-to-day military confrontation with Israel of a guerrilla commando type, the doctrine of gathering strength necessary for the knockout blow against Israel. The discussion centered on method and not on aims.

(6) The use, or rather the abuse, of the Arab refugee problem as a political instrument in the war against Israel and the blocking of every serious proposal for dealing with the Arab refugee problem on a humanitarian basis.

These policies culminated in the action taken by the United Arab Republic between May 14 and June 5, 1967. These actions removed the three pillars upon which the relative quiescence of the Middle East rested during the ten year period 1957-1967. These pillars were:

First, unrestricted freedom of passage through the Straits of Tiran;

Second, the virtual demilitarization of the Sinai Peninsula and the avoidance of a confrontation between Egyptian and Israeli forces on the Sinai border;

Third, the insulation of the Gaza Strip from use for the purposes of commando raids against Israel, with the use of the United Nations Emergency Force as the symbol for this.

After the 14th of May events developed rapidly. The United Nations Emergency Force was peremptorily withdrawn at the United Arab Republic's request, massive Egyptian forces were building up on the Egyptian border, the Straits of Tiran were blocked and UNEF position on the Gaza Strip border were taken over by the Palestine Liberation Army.

The real issue now before the United Nations is whether there can be an acquiescence in the assertion by Member States of the rights and practices of belligerence. The road to progress in the future depends upon the immediate application of the Charter for the demand that this assertion and the practices emanating from it must cease without delay.

Insufficient attention has been paid to another grave consequence of the Arab position during the past 19 years. A principle victim of the doctrine of non-recognition of Israel and of the policy of hostility and belligerence has been the absence of any regional Middle Eastern organization or development. While the heavy emphasis on the arms race has diverted vital resources from economic development to war preparations on the part of the Arab countries, it has equally blocked the vitally needed effort to develop regional projects for the effective use of water, planning of communications, the movement of trade and the growth of international travel and tourism. Thus, the people of the area have been doubly deprived. There has been a diversion of resources from development to military expansion and a denial of the numerous advantages that would result from effective regional cooperation in all areas. The principal suffers from this policy have been the Arab refugees whose economic integration into the area would otherwise have been speedily possible.

It is this analysis of the past 19 years which must point the way to the course to be followed in the future. The States of the Middle East must take their destiny into their own hands and consult the interests of their own peoples. It is not enough for an Egyptian newspaper to say that it was a tactical propaganda mistake for the Arabs

July 18, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8895

to proclaim the goal of Israel's elimination. What is needed is a change of policy. It is not enough for an Arab State to take the tactical position that an Israeli withdrawal must first be attempted by political means before military means are used. What is needed is an affirmative decision to withdraw from the doctrine and practice of belligerency, and to view the future of the Middle East and of its peoples in terms of positive cooperation. The road to peace in the Middle East is the same road as for peace in the world—it is the road of harmony in diversity—the search for common constructive interests.

This is the view which Israel has been pressing and will continue to advance as a policy for the solution of the problems of our area. This is what is needed by the peoples of the Middle East. This is the effective contribution which the Middle East as a whole can make to the peace of the world.

Finally, a word about the Israel doctrine of direct negotiations. It is said that this is unrealistic. The record is that the only progress that has ever been made in the Arab-Israel situation has been the product of direct Arab-Israel talks. The further record is that where a body has been interposed between the Arab States and Israel, the Arabs have used that body not in order to create a link but in order to perpetuate an absence of communication. If it is agreed that the Charter calls for the pacific settlement of disputes between States, the practice of direct negotiations is not only not unrealistic—it is the only certain and effective method for progress.

(Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DINGELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE JEWISH STAKE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish stake in Vietnam is a very vital one, for wherever communism gains control, the Jew is denied his religious freedom and in effect his existence as a spiritual human being.

Meir Kahane, chairman of the American Jewish Friends of Vietnam, has written a thorough and informative series entitled "The Jewish Stake in Vietnam."

I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Kahane's series, which appeared in the Jewish Press from April 7 to June 2, 1967.

The series follows:

THE JEWISH STAKE IN VIETNAM
(By Meir Kahane)

(United States forces are today fighting in Vietnam to check Communist aggression. All Americans have a stake in this grim war but Jews have a very special interest in the successful outcome of this struggle. For, wherever the Communist machine achieves power, not only are political, social and economic rights swept away, but spiritual persecution is inevitably and mercilessly practiced. Because of this, it is vital that the Jew realize the danger to his very survival as a free human being should Communism ever achieve victory. The Jewish Press, in line with its policy of alerting America to the dangers of totalitarianism from Right and

Left, is beginning a comprehensive series on The Struggle For Freedom In Vietnam. The writer of the series, aside from being a regular contributor to the Jewish Press, is also chairman of the American Jewish Friends of Vietnam and an expert on Communist threats to democracy and religious freedom.)

RELIGION IN VIETNAM

As in the case of Korea, the most vigorous and unified religious group in the state of Vietnam was that of the Christians, the Catholics in particular. In an Asian country, they made up 2,400,000 people of a total population of 25,000,000 prior to the division of the country in 1954. This was almost 10% of the total and made Vietnam the Asian state with the second largest population of Catholics.

Because of this, the Vietnamese Communists moved slowly and carefully. In line with the general policy of Ho Chi Minh, which was to soft-pedal his true aims so long as he had need of the non-communist forces in the fight against the French, Catholics were not treated harshly. As the communists consolidated their power, however, things began to change.

During the struggle for independence against the French, there were at least two incidents of violent massacres perpetrated by the Communists against Catholic villages in Thai Binh province in the Red River Delta. It was reported at Cao Mai, 180 Catholics, including women and children, were burned to death in the village church after the French refused to surrender.

In 1951, as the fighting against the French grew in intensity, a certain irrigation network was severely damaged by French bombs. The Communists, in this period of time, were engaged in a double war. The first was against the French colonial regime. In this, they were hardly the only Vietnamese group struggling for freedom. There were numerous other nationalists who sought independence also and they were persuaded by Ho Chi Minh to join with the Reds in a united front to be known as the Vietminh. In this framework, Ho fought his second war—to eliminate the strongest forces within the non-communist groups. With the French bombing, Ho saw a great opportunity to accomplish a major part of his second aim. Claiming that the bombing was a result of a "conspiracy by traitors" the Communists singled out their most feared rivals in every province. Among them were the most senior Buddhist monk, the Catholic Bishop and the most influential Confucianist. Public trial were held during which the defendants were allowed no counsel. There were only "defenders" who demanded severe punishment for these "ring leaders."

Hoang Van Chi was a non-communist member of the Viet Minh. He believed the Communists at first and he saw the trials. He described them in part as follows:

"Trials were public which meant they were attended by delegations of party members, one from the villagers' and another from workers' organizations. The delegates were granted at least two weeks to memorize all the slogans they would be required to shout..."

THE GENEVA AGREEMENT

The Catholics realized what the Communist had in store for them. Thus, when the fighting between the Viet Minh and the French came to an end within the signing of the Geneva Agreement in 1954 and Vietnam was to be divided into North and South at the 17th parallel, the Catholics knew what they had to do.

Under Article 14d of the Agreement, all civilians who wished to move from one zone to another were given 300 days to do so, from July 22, 1954 to May 1955. The Communists agreed to this, little realizing what would happen. To the chagrin of the Reds, 819,131 refugees requested to be transferred to the South while only 4,792 asked to be

moved North. It was a crushing propaganda blow to the Communists as the refugees—mainly Catholics escaping religious persecution—chose freedom over Red tyranny.

The Communists now used all means available to prevent the departures, Ba-Lang, a Catholic village in Thanh-Hoa province served as a departure point for refugees going South. On Jan. 20, 1955, 700 youths were arrested and taken away; their final destination was never disclosed. Four other youths were executed on the spot and seven persons, including one woman, were given life terms for opting for freedom. On Jan. 25, 1955, Vint Minh troops killed 12 villagers in the town of Luu-My. The bishopric of Phat-Diem was blockaded for weeks in an attempt to dissuade villagers from leaving for the South.

Many people were arrested for advocating evacuation. They were tried by People's Courts and either sentenced to forced labor or sent to concentration camps. Still another device was the creation of the movement called "training to foil the intrigues of the propagandists for the exodus toward the South." These were entrusted with:

- 1) Preventing the sale of real estate, livestock, rice fields belonging to emigrants;
- 2) Inciting inhabitants to refuse hospitality, ferry-crossings and truck and barge transportation to departing people;
- 3) Encouraging inhabitants to spy on each other and to denounce all attempts to escape;
- 4) Dispersing those who want to contact the ICC (The International Control Commission whose job it was to supervise the carrying out of the Agreements' provisions- ed.)
- 5) Outwitting the ICC teams whenever possible;
- 6) Arresting suspects, leaders, petitioners and taking action against them for imaginary crimes;
- 7) Increasing the obstacles in the process of issuing permits.

A radio dispatch from Hanoi at the time showed all too clearly how the Communist cadres and the Red authorities were moving heaven and earth to prevent communication between the Catholic masses and the priests:

"One hundred and eighteen priests are held prisoners by the Communist Vietminh, according to mission authorities in Vietnam. Their information is delayed; perhaps incomplete. It is possible that some of the priests are dead. The Geneva Agreement calls for the release of all civilian as well as military prisoners by August 20.

"One hundred and two priest-prisoners are Vietnamese; one is a Laotian; 15 are foreigners..."

"In the Vietminh areas, priests not imprisoned are restricted in their movements. They are usually confined to one village, sometimes to just the church premises.

"Of the four Bishops in the Vietminh area at the time of the cease fire none is free. One is imprisoned and the other three have been removed from their residences and virtually interned..."

The reason for the mass exodus of Catholics was stark and simple: Religious persecution. In particular, there was involved the fate of Catholic children who were not only barred in all ways from meaningful religious education but who were taught to despise their religion in the schools. Thus, according to the National Catholic Welfare Conference's, "Terror In Vietnam":

"The Communist Vietminh oblige Catholics to attend classes in atheism. They forbid the teaching of catechism to Catholic children... Communists from other places conduct classes that all must attend... The instructors call the Mass a 'joke' and deny the existence of G-d, heaven and hell... If you refuse to take notes or to agree with the instructors during discussions you are 'reactionary.' The Catholic primary school was the only one in the district. The Viet-

H 8896

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 18, 1967

minh took it over and teach the children straight Marxism. . . .

Little wonder that over 800,000 people defied the Communists and endured all manner of pressure and torture for the sake of freedom. One particular village stands as a stark example of this. It was the village of Thuong Phuoc in the Thai Binh province and we will tell its story next week, please G-d.

[From the Jewish Press, Apr. 14, 1967]

THE JEWISH STAKE IN VIETNAM

(By Meir Kahane)

THUONG PHUC

The Geneva Agreement had provided for free and unfettered emigration from either zone. According to Article 14d:

"From the date of entry into force of the present agreement until the movement of troops is completed, any civilians, residing in a district controlled by one party, who wish to go and live in a zone assigned to the other party, shall be permitted and helped to do so by the authorities in that district."

The right of option was to last for 300 days, from July 22, 1954 to May, 1955. The story of the Catholic village of Thuong Phuoc is an example of the sanctity of a Communist promise, especially as it relates to religious freedom.

LIFE UNDER THE VIETMINH

The three thousand Catholics of Thuong Phuoc had lived under Vietminh (Communist) rule since April, 1952. From the start the Red regime had shown what they might expect under the Marxist banner. They arrested the assistant priest, Father Dominic Khang, twice. He had to leave in May 1953. The parish priest, himself, was not allowed to attend sick calls outside the village. The dying could receive Catholic Sacraments only if they were carried across country to the church. In order to attend Mass one had to be issued a pass by the Communists. At all meetings, Bishops and priests were scornfully attacked.

When news of the Geneva Agreement was received the people reacted joyfully. Here was their opportunity to flee tyranny and worship as they wished. Taking advantage of the Agreement they informed the authorities that they intended to exercise their right to emigration. It was planned to leave after 7 o'clock Mass August 15.

As the thousands gathered outside the church Communist cadres ordered them to wait for a meeting. For over an hour, the Vietminh harangued them, using all possible arguments to dissuade them from departing.

The people were unimpressed and unbending. They had made up their minds and they had chosen freedom. They went home, got their little bundles and set out with their priest, Father Thiep, at the head of the column. Men, women and children trudged down the road, every step taking them closer to freedom.

THE FIRST ATTEMPT

A short distance from the main village, the marchers stopped short. There, barring the road, were 500 armed Vietminh soldiers waiting for them. Dominic Tap, 58 years old, was beaten with guns. Eleven other men were thrown to the ground and their arms bound tightly behind them. The priest was marched back to the village under armed guard.

The people looked at each other. What should they do now? About one thousand of the villagers turned and walked slowly back to the tyranny that would be their lot. The rest decided to go on.

After awhile, the Vietminh, realizing that the International Control Commission which had been set up to supervise the free movement of refugees, knew about the village's choice, had to unbind the eleven prisoners. The column, smaller than before, moved on.

MORE OBSTACLES

For the next four days, the column of men, women and children was harassed by the Communists. They struggled on against threats and of violence.

Twice armed soldiers tried to stop them. At a former French outpost guards put a barbed wire barrier across the road to prevent them from passing. They left the road and pushed into the flooded rice fields to bypass the barrier. Even women, carrying infants over their heads, went through the breast-high water.

When they reached Vannam, they sought out the ferryman to carry them across the river. The Vietminh intervened and forbade the boatman to do so. At this, some turned back. The rest continued on foot to Ninh Giang where they were able to hire boats.

They were across the river and within reach of their goal. For here were motor vehicles going to Haiduong in Free Vietnam. They eagerly began to pay their fare and about 200 succeeded in getting on the vehicles before the Communists suddenly appeared and forbade the rest to get on.

THE LAST PART

There were only about 600 left now. These set out on foot toward Dienan. There was the boundary line, the divider between freedom and a tyranny. There was only one obstacle. The boundary was a river—a wide river.

When they arrived, the Communists were waiting. They had already forbidden the boatman to take any of them. The refugees were forced to spend the next two nights on the river bank.

Five Vietminh now appeared and attempted, through all means, to persuade them to return to their village. One threatened to take away the babies from their mothers. The refugees stood firm.

Father Khang, the former assistant priest, who was now in a refugee camp nearby in the free zone across the river, heard of the plight of his former parishioners. He tried desperately to find means to get the people across but could only find one row-boat which he brought by truck to the river.

On the morning of August 19, Father Khang and his helpers started ferrying refugees over but only a dozen could fit in the boat at a time. It was only after the third crossing that nine large boats appeared which carried the rest of the people to freedom.

This was the story of a village of people who sought to worship in their particular way. Let it be remembered that only 600 of the original 3,000 found freedom. The rest remained behind, forced by threats, coercion and force. They were not the only ones to remain behind against their will. Stories of violence and pressure against refugees are too numerous to mention. The Red regime in Hanoi was determined, not only to crush religion, but to prevent its adherents from finding a refuge.

RELIGION TODAY

"To be religious in Vietnam today is to suffer all the excesses of Marxism. The usual puppet "patriotic" church has been set up according to Gerard Tongas, "to be a party to all the exactions of the regime of whom they are servants, and particularly to attempt to prove that Catholicism and Communism can form an excellent marriage."

The real position of the Church, however, is described by the late expert on Vietnam Bernard Fall who wrote:

(Recent policies include) arrest of priests and the faithful, confiscation of church property, interdiction of correspondence with church authorities located outside the territory of the Republic, excessive taxation of church land and buildings, etc."

In a word, what North Vietnam aims at doing to its own people and those of South Vietnam should it ever succeed in defeating us may be gathered from the words of Truong

Chinh, former Secretary General of the Vietnamese Communist Party and Vice Premier of North Vietnam:

"The aim of the present revolution is that the entire people . . . should thoroughly absorb the Socialist (i.e. Communist) ideology, that they should abandon their previous outlook on life and on the world and replace it with a Marxist viewpoint."

[From the Jewish Press, Apr. 21, 1967]

THE JEWISH STAKE IN VIETNAM

(By Meir Kahane)

VIETNAM AND ISRAEL

Readers of the Christian Science Monitor of March 29, 1967 were startled to find in its "Focus on Middle East," the following item:

"There's more Middle East liaison between the Viet Cong and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) of Ahmed Shukairy."

"The Cairo Mission of the Viet Cong (Vietnam National Liberation Front) is the largest and most active in the area. Its members have met with Palestinian Arabs to arrange for combat training in North Vietnam for Shukairy followers."

"A first contingent of PLO men has already returned to bases in Syria from training in Communist China. And the latest development is agreement for a Viet Cong mission in Syria, main base of PLO activity against Israel."

Startling to many, it is true, and undoubtedly upsetting to those circles which tend to paint the Viet Cong as a hapless and harassed group seeking to bring agrarian revolution and reform to South Vietnam which is under a military dictatorship and feudal heel.

There is certainly little doubt that it must have caused some soul searching among those Jewish circles—American Jewish Congress in particular—who have rejected the morality of the United States presence in the battle for Vietnam's freedom and called for a non-reciprocal halt to bombing of the North and recognition of this very same Viet Cong as a legitimate party and its inclusion in a coalition government in Saigon.

It has not been so startling, however, to the hard core experts on Vietnam, who have recognized from the beginning that the Peking-Hanoi axis includes the Vietcong in its bitter determination to spread totalitarian Communism throughout Asia and which has offered countless examples of its refusal to recognize not only the government of Israel but the very right of existence of the Jewish State.

NOT A NEW DEVELOPMENT

The romance between the Arabs, under the Jew-hater Ahmed Shukairy, and the Viet Cong is part of a close liaison between the Arab and the Chinese Communists. (This attachment was touched upon in previous articles in the Jewish Press).

It deserves a little closer study.

As early as October, 1964, Shukairy had declared in Damascus that "since the doors of the West are closed to us" he would send delegations to Moscow and Peking for help to his Palestine Liberation Organization.

These were not empty words since in May of that year Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev had already assured Russian support for a "just solution of the Palestine problem" (one, of course, needs little imagination to discover just what "just" means).

Unfortunately, for Shukairy, however, Russian support was limited, for the most part, to declarations. It is true that Soviet arms were reaching the PLO but they were not new arms nor were they being sent directly by the Soviet to Shukairy. Most of the weapons were being supplied to the Palestinians by Presidents Nasser and Aref of Egypt and Iraq, respectively, and these were being withdrawn from their stockpiles of Soviet arms as Moscow sent newer types.